

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 18, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-8 and 14-21, and identified claims 9-13 as being withdrawn. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-5 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059651) in view of Gorelik (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047372). Applicant respectfully believes that the rejections can be withdrawn for the reasons set forth below.

In rejecting independent claims 1 and 14, the Examiner found Gorelik to disclose an ETL designer module. In particular, the Examiner found the destination column class and association class of the ETL designer module described in claims 1 and 14 to read on the “XFRORM RULES (Declarative Rules)” 210 of FIG. 6B. There is no support for this finding.

In particular, Gorelik fails to disclose that the rules 210 include “a destination column class defining destination column objects each identifying a destination column of the reporter table” or “an association class defining association objects each identifying an association of at least one source column of the financial table with a destination column identified by a corresponding destination column object,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. In fact, Applicant was not able to locate any discussion of the rules 210 in Gorelik. Thus, there is no support for the Examiner’s finding.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner’s finding that the transformation engine 114 (FIG. 6A) of Gorelik discloses “a transformation class defining transformation objects each responsible for a transformation of the source data elements of the source column into a reporter format of the associated destination column as identified by a corresponding association object,” as provided in claims 1 and 14. In particular, the cited transformation engine 114 is not described by Gorelik as defining the particular transformation objects recited in claims 1 and 14. Thus, there is no support for the Examiner’s finding.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner's finding that FIG. 6 of Gorelik, "depicts instructions for configuring" and discloses "generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module," as provided in claim 14. In particular, Applicant cannot discern where in FIG. 6 the recited method step is disclosed. There does not appear to be any support for the Examiner's finding. As discussed previously, Gorelik fails to disclose any manner in which the ETL packages are formed in the ETL system mentioned in paragraph [0006] of Gorelik.

While the Examiner found that MaGuire fails to disclose an extraction, transformation and loading (ETL) designer module, the Examiner still found FIG. 1 and paragraph [0022] of MaGuire to disclose "generating instructions for configuring an ETL package to extract the source data elements of the source column, transform the source data elements into the reporter format in accordance with the transformation object, and load the transform source data elements into the associated destination columns of the reporter table in accordance with the association objects," as provided in claim 14. These findings by the Examiner clearly conflict. As stated previously, Gorelik also fails to disclose the manner in which an ETL package is configured.

Accordingly, the cited references do not disclose "an ETL designer module stored on the tangible computer-readable medium, executable by the processor, and designed to configure the ETL package," as provided in claim 1, or "generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module," as provided in claim 14. Therefore, the references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the system of claim 1 or the method of claim 14. Accordingly, claims 1 and 14 are non-obvious in view of the cited references.

Because the references fail to explicitly disclose the elements of claims 1 and 14, the Examiner appears to be arguing that the elements of the claims are inherently disclosed by references. However, such an inherency argument cannot be supported by the teachings of Gorelik because the claimed elements are not necessarily disclosed by the references. In particular, the Examiner has not provided any justification for the apparent finding that the cited rules 210 must necessarily include the claimed "destination column class defining destination column objects each identifying a destination column of the reporter table" or the "association class defining association

objects each identifying an association of at least one source column of the financial table with a destination column identified by a corresponding destination column object” recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

Applicant has previously requested that the Examiner specifically identify each element recited in the claims. However, the Examiner has not identified where the cited references disclose “an ETL package,” “source data elements,” “a financial table,” “a financial data store,” “a reporter table,” “destination column objects,” “destination column,” “association objects,” “source column,” and “transformation objects,” as provided in claims 1 and 14. While the Examiner cites elements, such as rules 210 or transformation engine 114 of Gorelik as disclosing some of these elements, the Examiner has failed to provide any support for the contention. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and the disclosure pertaining to the cited elements, and cannot discern any support for the Examiner’s finding. Accordingly, Applicant must again request that the Examiner specifically identify the elements of the cited references corresponding to the elements of the claims. Further, in the event that a cited reference does not explicitly disclose a claimed element, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide a detailed explanation supporting the finding.

For at least the above reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established against independent claims 1 and 14. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Additionally, claims 2-4, 8 and 15-21 are non-obvious in view of the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to either claim 1 or 14, from which they depend. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn. Additional grounds for withdrawing the rejections of some of the dependent claims are provided below.

In rejecting claims 4 and 17, the Examiner found Gorelik to teach “a nested relational data model wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns ([0122] discusses concatenating) . . . .” Applicant disagrees with this finding for the reasons previously presented in the Response filed March 4, 2009, which was not addressed by the Examiner in the present Office Action.

With regard to claim 21, the Examiner found paragraph [0031] of MaGuire to disclose the

subject matter of claim 21. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this finding for the reasons set forth in the Response filed March 4, 2009, which was not addressed by the Examiner in the present Office Action.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059651) and Gorelik (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047372) in view of Pape (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059651). Claims 6 and 7 are non-obvious in view of the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to independent claim 1, from which they depend. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully believes that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By: /Brian D. Kaul/  
Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, Washington 98052-6399  
Phone: (425) 707-9382

BDK/eap